

*Adjournment Debate*

various times in a number of maritime ports during the next four months to purchase gaspereau and mackerel.

In return for the commitments given by Joint Trawlers, to supply five freezer vessels for a number of months and purchase the fish at a predetermined price, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans has agreed, as an extension of its commensurate benefits policy, that Joint Trawlers will receive a direct allocation this year of 6,200 metric tons of species which have not been traditionally fished offshore by Canadians, including grenadier and Greenland halibut in the Davis Strait in Canadian waters, mackerel or silver hake, and a small amount of squid. No contract has yet been signed with Joint Trawlers and exact quantities of each species are still being discussed. The harvesting of this direct allocation will generate revenues of approximately \$125,000 to the Government of Canada as the foreign vessels will be subject to all foreign access and fishing fees in accordance with Canadian regulations.

We cannot be absolutely certain where the fish that are the subject of this arrangement will end up being marketed but, as the offshore allocation and the inshore program are mostly composed of mackerel, it will likely be sold in east European and West African countries.

In 1979 revenue to fishermen from over-the-side sales accounted for less than 1 per cent of the total value of fish landed on the Atlantic coast. Departmental officials met at the request of the minister with processors and fishermen in the maritimes earlier this year. The processors were not prepared to make firm commitments on prices and quantities of gaspereau and mackerel. On the other hand, the offer from Joint Trawlers is for at least 9,000 metric tons of mackerel, at a price of 12.3 cents per pound. I ask hon. members to compare the alternatives. The facts speak for themselves. There are many areas in the maritime provinces—

● (2210)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn).

IMMIGRATION—TIMOTHY LEARY—ENTRY INTO CANADA—  
HOTEL ENGAGEMENTS

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South):** Mr. Speaker, April 21, I had occasion to ask certain questions of the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) about one Timothy Leary. Mr. Leary is a citizen of the United States and was convicted of certain offences, which make him an unacceptable person to Canada unless he obtained, prior to coming to this country, permission from the minister through a minister's permit by order in council.

Apparently, Mr. Leary, through his agents and lawyer, applied for permission to come to Canada. He had previously applied on other occasions and had been turned down by previous ministers. Mr. Leary apparently applied, according to the minister's statement in reply to a question by me in this

House, on April 23rd, because he wanted to come to Canada to perform in Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal.

Strangely enough, Mr. Leary turned up in Winnipeg as his first port of call. The minister, unfortunately for him, is a limited partner in a hotel in Winnipeg which is managed by his brother, and the minister is responsible to the people of Canada in exercising his quasi judicial ministerial responsibility. I asked the minister a number of questions, and I was not satisfied with his answers. In one of his answers the minister said that his officials had prepared the material. This left me with the impression, and I am sure the House as well, that instead of making the decision himself as to who should come into the country, he had left the matter in the hands of his officials.

In so doing the minister abrogated his ministerial responsibility by delegating his authority. Probably this is what happened, because I am sure that the minister, knowing him as I do, would not have deliberately exercised his authority to deliberately cause Mr. Leary to come to Canada to look after his brother's hotel. The problem, however, is the minister's, and according to the act he is responsible and not allowed to delegate his authority. Therefore he must stand responsible for what in fact has happened.

What happened was that a ministerial responsibility was exercised and clearly, a concrete explanation is necessary. It may well be properly explained in that the minister may have been deceived by his officials. If that is the case, then the minister should have no particular reason not to file the application which was originally presented in order to have Mr. Leary considered this time around for entry into Canada. Neither should the minister have any concern in tabling in the House, because this is a serious matter, the details of the application.

However, when the minister was asked in this House to table these documents on April 21, the minister refused or did not offer to file the material. On April 22 a question of privilege was raised by the minister, and there was a reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. However, that reference is not clear as to whether it refers to the Leary matter or another matter which the minister himself brought to the attention of the House with regard to certain grants paid to the same hotel with respect to employment of handicapped people. I admire the efforts that have been made in existing statutes to encourage the employment of handicapped people and of all unemployed people.

● (2215)

One of the concerns of this House must be the detail and specific requirements of section 16 of the Senate and House of Commons Act. It may be that when the legislation was drawn in 1878 the section was appropriate, but it is totally inappropriate in today's situation where all sorts of statutes of Canada provide for payment to individuals of Canada or corporations of Canada, of money from Canada. Members have been known to collect the old age pension; their wives have been known to collect baby bonuses, and members have been known